

REMARKS

In the February 21, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-40 were pending in the application and rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). In rejecting the claims, the Examiner cited the BEA Product Family Overview <http://edocs.bea.com/wlcs/docs35/intro/wlcsview.htm> (July 2, 2001), having 24 pages as printed and attached to the August 11, 2006 Office Action. New claim 41 is added herein. Thus, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 remain pending in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

BEA Product Family Overview

The BEA Product Family Overview (hereinafter BEA – citations are referenced by the page numbers of the printed BEA Product Family Overview that the Examiner attached to the August 11, 2006 Office Action) discloses the various BEA WebLogic products. For the purpose of the overview, the Applicant will discuss the WebLogic Personalization Server. The WebLogic Personalization Server can “tailor an application to a particular individual or group based on any number of criteria. The criteria can be predefined user attributes such as age and gender, or can be based on behavioral information gathered as the user navigates the site” (see page 14, of BEA).

The Personalization Server contains an “Advisor [that] uses an embedded rules engine to provide content personalization capabilities” such as “classif[ying] a user and creat[ing] a dynamic query into the content database to return personalized content for that user” (see page 15, of BEA). To “help group properties that are related to each other” Personalization Server uses “property sets” (see page 17, of BEA). “[S]ites that rely on self-registration [may] rely on WebLogic Personalization Server user management tools” (see page 17, of BEA).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by BEA.

Claim 1 recites “a contribution receiving part receiving a contribution from the user and storing the contribution in said reference information storage part” (see lines 9-12 of Claim 1). The Examiner states that “a user can configure information in user profile, which allows the personalized server to retrieve personalized contents from the provider”, broadly citing pages 1-24 of BEA, which provides an overview of the BEA WebLogic product family (see page 4, lines 1-4, of the Office Action). However, the WebLogic product family described in the reference

contains *three* distinct products – Campaign Manager, Commerce Server and Personalization Server (see page 1, of BEA). The Applicant reminds the Examiner that “[i]n rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the [E]xaminer must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or *shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant*, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable” (see MPEP § 706 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.104, emphasis added).

Here, the Examiner has cited the entirety of the BEA product family website, which includes multiple products as listed above. The Applicant cannot definitively determine which of the BEA products the Examiner is referring to in making the rejection. The above incongruity with MPEP § 706 also applies to the relevant parts of claims 9, 17 and 33, as well as claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-24, 26-32 and 35-40, where the Examiner cites the entirety of the BEA reference (pages 1-24) without specifically pointing out which portions of the reference that the Examiner relied upon. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically designate the particular part(s) relied upon in the BEA reference to make the rejections.

Further, nowhere does the BEA reference disclose the contribution receiving part as recited, for example, in claim 1. In rejecting this feature, the Examiner mentions that “a user can configure information in user profile, which allows the personalized server to *retrieve* [emphasis added] personalized contents from the provider” on page 4, lines 1-4, of the Office Action, but configuring a profile is not “receiving a *contribution* from the user” as recited, for example, on line 9 of claim 1. BEA merely “tailor[s] an application to a particular individual or group based on any number of criteria” (page 14). Hence, the BEA reference does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 1 also recites “a reference range defining part referring to the reference range defining information stored for a user by said reference range defining information storage part and defining a range of the reference information stored by said reference information storage part, in which range the reference information is available for the user to refer to” (see lines 5-8 of Claim 1). The Examiner asserts that BEA discloses these features. However, this is not the case because a “reference range” differs from a “rule” generated by a rules engine.

In BEA, the “rules engine classifies a user and creates a dynamic query into a content database to return personalized content for that user” (page 15, first full paragraph). To “help group properties that are related to each other” Personalization Server uses “property sets” (see page 17, of BEA). In other words, a user is classified and contents are retrieved accordingly. Conversely, claim 1 recites that a *range* of the reference information is available for the user to

refer to. For example, in some embodiments of the present invention, an “actual search is performed only within the range thus defined” (page 10, lines 1 and 2, of the application). Thus, a reference range and a rule are nonequivalent and BEA fails to disclose the above features.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the Applicant “did not claim ‘a contributor can determine a scope of the contributed contents which is allowed to be viewed by a viewer, and the view allowing scope specifying information is stored’”. However, claim 1 clearly claims this feature. Reference range defining information is stored for a user, which determines the scope of contributed contents that can be viewed. The scope specifying information is further stored in the reference information storage part. Hence, claim 1 definitively claims that a contributor can determine a scope of the contributed contents, which is allowed to be viewed by a viewer, and the view allowing scope specifying information is stored.

Independent claims 9, 17 and 33 also recite referring to the reference range defining information stored for a user and receiving a contribution from a user. Thus, claims 9, 17 and 33 are also distinguishable over the BEA reference per the arguments above for claim 1.

Claims 3-8, 11-16, 19-32 and 35-40 each depend from claim 1, 9, 17 or 33 and add further limitations thereto. Therefore, these claims also distinguish over the BEA reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

New Claim

New claim 41 is added herein. Claim 41 recites an information processing method, comprising:

- storing a predetermined information management rule for a particular user;
- applying the stored information management rule to automatically select information from an information source in accordance with the information management rule;
- making accessible a range of information that is less than all of the information and meeting the applied information management rule so as to define and make available a range of information that is suitable for each user; and
- receiving and storing a contribution from a user.

Per the above, claim 41 recites “making accessible a range of information that is less than all of the information” (lines 5 and 6). BEA fails to disclose this feature anywhere in the reference. Thus, claim 41 also distinguishes over BEA.

Summary

It is submitted that the BEA reference cited by the Examiner does not suggest or teach the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-33 and 35-41 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 21, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501